123.001

THE FOREIGN SERVICE
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OFFICE OF CHINESE AFFAIRS
JUL 6 1950
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs
JUL
Assistant Secretary
Department of State

Handle as:
TOP SECRET

ADDRESS OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS TO:

American Embassy,
Taipei, Taiwan, June 27, 1950.

Never send to DC/R - 7/12/50 - RGE

SECRET
Official-Informal

Dear Tony:

Although the subject matter may best be left unacted on as a delicate matter arising at a late date, I feel it desirable to bring it to your attention.

About two months ago Lt. Col. Poston, Assistant Army Attaché briefly remarked that Chinese military circles seemed to trust only Air Attaché Gault, Assistant Naval Attaché Salmon, and himself, and felt that Col. Barrett's duty in Yenan and connection with Jack Service there made him suspect.

Today Poston called on me and stated that last night the Intelligence Officer of the CAF stated specifically that the Chinese Military were willing to provide information of highly classified nature only to certain of the attachés and that past connections of others rendered them suspect. This might include Col. Gabbert as well as Barrett.

Poston disavowed any personal motive in expressing his concern, and I am prepared to believe him, even though I know he feels that Barrett exercises too much control over him and Barrett considers him an "eager beaver" who does, however, turn up a lot of good information.

I told Poston I would think the matter over, but that it was of such a nature and came at such a time that on the face of it I could see no advantage in carrying it further. The reason that I am writing is to record my belief that Poston may very well be right. This is without any animus whatsoever against Barrett,

Fulton Freeman, Esquire,
Acting Director for Chinese Affairs,
Department of State,
Washington 25, D. C.

SECRET

against Barrett, who is a very "savvy gentleman" when it comes to the Chinese and a good American as you know. The restrictions placed on the attachés by the Ministry of National Defense (reported in my telegram No. 956 of June 21) may have been promulgated partly with a view to keeping Barrett as uninformed as possible.

If aired in Washington, quite a controversy could arise from this letter, and Poston might find himself in an awkward position. I believe that we may as well let the matter ride until events one way or the other solve it.

Sincerely,

Bob

Robert C. Strong